

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 27-29 are added. No new matter is added. Claims 14-28 are pending and under consideration.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

In item 2 on page 2 of the June 26, 2007 Office Action, claims 14-26 were rejected as anticipated by "Applicant admitted prior art" by citing Figs. 2 and 3 of the application. This rejections suggests that the Examiner either did not read all of the limitations recited in the claims, particularly claim 21, or did not give appropriate weight to the recited limitations. Therefore, an Interview with the Examiner is requested, so that the undersigned can obtain an understanding of how the Examiner is reading the claims, to avoid issuance of another Office Action that does not move examination forward.

It is submitted that nothing in Figs. 2 and 3, or anything else in the application that could be considered a description of prior art, discloses "at least one of said transceiving means **additionally connected** to the calibration antenna, for at least one of transmitting and receiving test signals via the antenna elements" (claim 14, lines 4-6, emphasis added). In FIGS 2 and 3, none of the transceiving means TX and RX of the antenna elements is connected to the calibration antenna. In the prior art, the calibration antenna has its own calibration transmitter (TXc) and receiver (RXc) circuits (see paragraph [0011] of the Substitute Specification which are not connected to any of antenna elements #1 ... #n. Thus, Figs. 2 and 3 do not anticipate all the features recited in claim 14. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully traverses, and requests reconsideration of the rejection.

Claims 15-20 depending directly or indirectly from independent claim 14 are also patentable at least by inheriting patentable features from independent claim 14.

Independent claim 21 recites a method distinguishing over the prior art at least by reciting "feeding the test signals to the at least one of the transceivers connected to the calibration antenna" (claim 21, lines 8-9) and "receiving the test signals by the calibration antenna and the at least one of the transceivers connected thereto" (claim 21, lines 22-23). Therefore, claim 21, as well as claims 22-25 depending directly or indirectly from claim 21, patentably distinguish over Figs. 2 and 3 of the application.

Independent claim 26 recites "transmitting the test signals via the antenna elements in a transmission gap in a time frame of a time division duplex system" (claim 26, lines 20-21). There is no suggestion in Figs. 2 and 3 or anything else in the application that could be considered a

description of prior art that teaches or suggests such a feature. Therefore, claim 26 patentably distinguishes over Figs. 2 and 3 of the application.

New Claims

Claims 27 and 29 are respectively recite an apparatus and method supported by the specification and patentably distinguish over the cited prior art for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 14 and 21, respectively. Claim 28 further defines the calibration antenna as described, for example, in paragraphs 11 and 12 on page 3 of the Substitute Specification.

Request for Examiner Interview

In light of the changes in rules going into effect on November 1, 2007 which limit the number of opportunities for applicants to respond to rejections, particularly in a case like this where no prior art references were cited in rejecting the claims, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned to arrange an Examiner Interview prior issuance of another Office Action.

Conclusion

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: Nov. 7, 2007

By: L.Todor
Luminita A. Todor
Registration No. 57,639

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501